

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 20, 2006 for the above identified application. In the application claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-27 are pending of which claims 7-22 are withdrawn.

5 In the Office Action the Examiner objects to claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 23-27 for informalities and rejects the claims as being obvious over Yahav et al (US 6,057,909) in view of Vietze et al (SPIE Vol 2654). In response, claims 6, 7 and 11 are cancelled, claims 1, 8, 12, 13, 21 and 22 are amended and new claim 42 added. Subsequent to the current amendment, the application contains claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12-27 and 42 of which claims 1 and 42 are
10 independent claims and claims 8-10 and 12-22 are withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 24 are amended to correct informalities noted by the Examiner. Cosmetic changes are made to claims 8, 12, 13, 21 and 22 to adapt the claims to the cancellation of claims and addition of new claim 42.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitation recited in cancelled claim 7:

15 “a feedback capacitor separate from the light sensitive element connected between the input and output of each of the at least one amplifier by a plurality of connection switches and wherein for a first combination of open and closed connection switches a first terminal of the capacitor is connected to the input of the at least one amplifier and a second terminal of the capacitor is connected to the output of the amplifier and for a second combination of open and
20 closed switches the capacitor terminal connections are reversed”.

Neither Yahav nor Vietze teach or allude to anything similar to the features of the quoted limitation. Amended claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited prior art and claims dependent on claim 1 are patentable either through their dependence or through patentable material that they contain. Claim 1 is a generic claim for withdrawn dependent claims 8-10, 21
25 and 22 and these claims are presented for consideration.

New independent claim 42 recites the limitations of old claim 1 with the addition of limitations recited in cancelled dependent claim 11: “first and second amplifiers inside the pixel”, “first and second feedback capacitors” and “first and second gate switches”.


Neither Yahav nor Vietze teach or allude to anything similar to the limitations of
30 cancelled claim 11 noted above that are included in new claim 42. Claim 42 is therefore patentable over the cited prior art and claims dependent on claim 42 are patentable either through their dependence or through patentable material that they contain. Claim 42 serves as a generic claim for withdrawn dependent claims 12-20 and these claims are presented for consideration.

In view of the above, applicants submit that all the claims in the application are patentable and an allowance is respectfully solicited.

5

Respectfully submitted,
Gavriel J. IDDAN, et al.

10


Allan C. ENTIS
Reg. # 52,866

August 16, 2006

15

William H. Dippert, Esq
Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
250 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10177

20

Tel: (212) 986 1116